

REMARKS

The final Office Action of November 19, 2010 has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that all issues raised are traversed, being hereafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

Claims 1, 6-8, 12, 15, 16, 24, 27, 32, 35, 29, 42 and 44 have been amended. Claim 14 has been cancelled and claims 48 and 49 are newly added. It is submitted that no new material has been added by the amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9-25, 27-32, 35-39 and 42-44 as being unpatentable over Rigole (US 7,139,728 B2) in view of Hanagan (US 2001/0056362). Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 7-8 and 47 as being unpatentable over Rigole and Hanagan in view of Gangopadhyay (US 6,973,638).

The claims have been amended to more clearly highlight distinctions over the cited prior art as combined by the Examiner. Specifically, the amended claims now include further definition of the interconnections between the plurality of components in the component combination in order to provide the desired service in the form of a sequence of service portions that are represented by the components.

For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite the following features, which can be seen in their proper context in the Amendments to the Claims as listed above:

- *"at least some of the components including one or more inputs for receiving data and/or one or more outputs for outputting data";*

- *"the component specifications being indicative of the data to be received by inputs and/or output from outputs of the corresponding component";*
- *"wherein the user defined interconnections are defined by the user as interconnections between one or more of the outputs of at least some of the components to one or more of the inputs of at least some other components";*
- *"wherein the sequence of service portions has a user defined order in which the service portions associated with the plurality of components in the component combination are to be performed";*
- *"wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed in the user defined order", and*
- *"wherein each service request includes an indication of the user defined interconnections of the respective inputs and/or outputs of the component with inputs and/or outputs of one or more other components in accordance with the component combination".*

Similar amendments have also been incorporated into the independent claims 24, 27, 32, 35, 39, 34 and 44. For conciseness purposes, the following arguments will focus on the patentability of the amended claim 1, and it is submitted that similar arguments will also apply in respect of the patentability of the remaining independent claims.

With reference to the amended claim 1, the claimed invention involves a method of allowing a user to obtain a desired service using a processing system, the method utilising components, each component corresponding to a respective service portion provided by a respective entity. At least some of the components include one or more inputs for receiving data and/or one or more outputs for outputting data.

As will be defined in further detail below, these inputs and/or outputs allow a user to define the desired service by simply selecting a plurality of components associated with service portions that will provide the overall desired service when implemented, and by defining

interconnections between outputs of some of the components and inputs of other components in order to define the transfers of data that are required to allow the desired service to be implemented. By defining these interconnections, the user also defines an order in which the service portions are to be performed when the plurality of components are implemented in accordance with the component combination. Accordingly, the claimed method gives the user the ability to define unique services that can be tailored to suit the user's requirements.

The method defined in the amended claim 1 specifically includes causing the processing system to perform the following steps.

The processing system provides component specifications to the user for a plurality of different components. These component specifications are indicative of the respective service portion associated with the corresponding component and the data to be received by inputs and/or output from outputs of the corresponding component. At least some of the different components are provided by different entities. This allows the user to select a plurality of components from a variety of available components for performing different service portions.

By providing component specifications of this type, the user is able to select the particular components which provide service portions that the user wishes to have performed as part of the desired service. For example, this allows the user to select from a number of components provided by different entities, but which are for performing similar service portions, and allows differentiation of those components based on the component specifications so that components can be selected with desired qualities such as cost, geographical location, duration of performing the service portion, etc.

Furthermore, by including an indication of the data to be received/output by inputs/outputs of the corresponding component, the user is able to select components which have desirable input/output characteristics. This also allows the user to select components which have compatible inputs and outputs when the user defines a component combination.

With the plurality of components selected, the processing system then determines a combination of the selected plurality of components in accordance with input commands received from the user. This defined component combination defines a sequence of service portions and one or more user defined interconnections between at least some of the components defining transfer of data between the entities of the respective components.

Specifically, the user defined interconnections are defined by the user as interconnections between one or more of the outputs of at least some of the components to one or more of the inputs of at least some other components. As a result of these user defined interconnections, the sequence of service portions defined by the component combination has a user defined order in which the service portions associated with the plurality of components in the component combination are to be performed.

Accordingly, this ability of the user to define the particular interconnections between the components allows the user to exercise a great deal of customisation in how a desired service is performed. For example, this can provide the user with complete control over the transfer of data between the components and the order in which the service portions are performed. As a result, the user is able to define a unique service that meets their particular requirements, by building up the service using discrete service portions. Since the services are represented by components, this allows a convenient way of defining the service without requiring the user to personally liaise with the entities providing the service portions. The implementation of the service is also made more convenient using this method, as will be described below.

Once the component combination has been defined by the user, the processing system implements the plurality of components in accordance with the component combination. This involves transferring a service request to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed in the user defined order that was established in the definition of the interconnections between the components. Each service request includes an indication of the

user defined interconnections of the respective inputs/outputs of the component with inputs/outputs of one or more other components in accordance with the component combination. This implementation of the plurality of components causes the sequence of service portions to be performed, such that the desired service is performed.

In the above discussed implementation, the service requests help to greatly simplify the organisational tasks required in having the components perform the service portions in a coordinated fashion to deliver the overall desired service. In this way, the user is able to have a service performed by a number of different, potentially distributed entities, without the user needing to personally coordinate the order of performing the discrete service portions or the transfer of data between the entities during implementation.

Having discussed the claimed invention as defined in the amended claim 1, the particular shortcomings of the cited prior art will now be discussed in detail.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that the previously pending claim 1 is unpatentable over Rigole in view of Hanagan. In particular, the Examiner has asserted that Rigole either fully or partially discloses a number of the features of the previously pending claim 1, but has acknowledged that Rigole does not explicitly state:

- *"allowing the user to select a plurality of components" (Rigole only allegedly discloses selecting one component);*
- *"determine a combination of the selected plurality of components" (Rigole only allegedly discloses a component combination that does not involve a selected plurality of components);*
- *"the defined component combination defining a sequence of service portions"*
- *"one or more user defined interconnections between at least some of the components" (Rigole only allegedly discloses interconnections that are not user defined);*

- *"implement the plurality of components" (Rigole only allegedly discloses implementing a single component)*
- *"wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed"*
- *"wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component"*
- *"thereby causing the sequence of service portions to be performed, such that the desired service is performed"*

However, the Examiner has identified disclosures of Hanagan which allegedly disclose the above listed features, and has asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Rigole and Hanagan in such a way as to disclose each of the features of the previously pending claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner believes that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Rigole with the teachings of Hanagan to include support for component combinations defining service portions and user defined interconnections between them and implementation of a service request by a respective component.

We respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the disclosures of Rigole and Hanagan, their alleged relevance to the features of the previously pending claim 1, and obviousness of combining the teachings of those documents to arrive at the claimed invention. Detailed arguments in this regard have been submitted with previous responses, and although the Examiner has not been persuaded by these arguments, the Applicant maintains that any proper combination of Rigole and Hanagan will not be sufficient to render the previously pending claim 1 obvious.

Nevertheless, in the interest of furthering prosecution we have amended the claim to include further limitations regarding the interconnections between the components and how the claimed method is used to perform a desired service by performing a sequence of service

portions associated with the components in the component combination. The method of the amended claim 1 is discussed in general terms above, however we will now specifically identify how the recitations of the amended claim 1 are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited prior art, either taken alone or in any proper combination.

Please note that we will not reiterate the comments of previous responses with regards to the non-obviousness of features which remain unchanged from the previously pending claim 1. However, this is not to be taken as a concession that the asserted combination of the prior art does in fact disclose each and every one of the features recited in the previously pending claim 1.

The newly recited features of the amended claim 1 were listed above. In general terms, the amendments specifically defined how the user defined interconnections are defined by the user by interconnecting inputs and outputs of the selected plurality of components in the component combination, such that the sequence of service portions defined by the component combination has a user defined order, and wherein the service request requesting performance of the service portion associated by each component indicates the user defined interconnections so that the sequence of service portions can be performed in the user defined order and with the user defined interconnections.

This method of the amended claim 1 allows a user to define a unique service by having discrete service portions performed in a particular order that is defined by the user and performed with particular transfers of data between the entities performing the service portions, which are also defined by the user. It is submitted that any combination of the prior art fails to deliver such an outcome, and this is due to the particular deficiencies of the prior art with respect to the following features.

The cited prior art fails to disclose *"the component specifications being indicative of the data to be received by inputs and/or output from outputs of the corresponding component"*. In one example, this feature of claim 1 allows the user to select the plurality of components having

knowledge of the types of data that can be received and/or output; so that components having particular desirable data transfer qualities can be selected for providing the desired service.

The Examiner has previously asserted that Rigole provides disclosures that are relevant to the feature of component specifications, such as at column 3, lines 39-42. However, the disclosures of Rigole in this regard merely discuss allowing the consumer to use service selection criteria such as price or service level to preferentially list different services to aid in selection of a single service. However, Rigole fails to disclose providing any indication of the data to be input/output characteristics of a component corresponding to a service portion, and hence the above mentioned feature of claim 1 is not shown by Rigole.

It is also noted that aspects of the amendments to claim 1 involving inputs and/or outputs and components specifications being indicative of the data to be received/output from these were at least to some extent originally defined in the dependent claim 6, with regards to the ports and associated port specifications, given that ports are a generalised terminology for referring to inputs and outputs of the components (as discussed on page 11, lines 26-27).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has asserted in the rejection of claim 6 that Rigole disclosed ports in the form of the endpoints of "data channels" at column 10, lines 1-3. However, as argued in the previous response, the "components" mentioned in this part of the Rigole's disclosure refer to components of a computer system, but not to components that are *"corresponding to a respective service portion provided by a respective entity"* as claimed. The Examiner has stated in item 48 of the outstanding Office Action that it is the disclosure of "services" by Rigole, as shown in column 3, lines 35-42, which can be interpreted as components. Under this interpretation, we respectfully submit that disclosures pertaining to data channels for transmission of data between hardware and software "components" of a computer system cannot possibly be relevant to inputs and outputs associated with the "services" of Rigole as described in column 3, lines 35-42.

It is also noted that the Examiner has also asserted in the rejection of claim 6 that Rigole discloses at column 6, lines 6-14, the feature of *"port specifications indicating an information to be received by or output from the port"*. Specifically, the Examiner has asserted that port specifications are disclosed in the context of Rigole's "data channels", although it has already been submitted that these disclosures cannot have any connection to the "services" of Rigole which the Examiner considers to be equivalent to components. Thus, the identified disclosures of Rigole cannot show the feature of the previously pending claim 6, and in turn, cannot show the above identified feature of the amended claim 1 which includes similar limitations. In any case, the selection of services in Rigole (as described in column 3, lines 42-49, does not involve providing any indication of the information/data to be received by inputs and/or output from outputs of any of the services to be selected, including any indication of data channels or the like, but is merely limited to providing criteria such as price and service level.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the feature of the amended claim 1 of *"the component specifications being indicative of the data to be received by inputs and/or output from outputs of the corresponding component"* is not shown by Rigole.

Hanagan also fails to disclose this claimed feature. As argued in previous responses, the so-called "components" of Hanagan are also not *"corresponding to a respective service portion provided by a respective entity"*. In reply, the Examiner has stated in item 52 of the Office Action that the claim terminology of "component" and "service portions" are instead equivalent to Hanagan's disclosures of "product" and "service" (as in paragraphs [0184] – [0184] of Hanagan). Accordingly, we assume that the Examiner has acknowledged that the "components" of Hanagan are not actually relevant to the "components" as claimed. Under this reasoning, any disclosures of Hanagan regarding details of the inputs/outputs of Hanagan's "components", such as the Order Processing, Customer Account Management, etc. cannot be relevant to the inputs/outputs of the components as defined in the claims (in any event, it is noted that the interfaces between the "components" of Hanagan are standardised and thus any specifications of the "component" do not need to provide details of

the data transfers associated with any inputs/outputs of the "components", as extensively discussed in previous responses).

Turning instead to how the selection of "services" to define new "products" in Hanagan is facilitated, for example, using the Products and Services Manager component discussed in paragraphs [0078] and [0182] – [0186], this merely involves providing a catalog having only basic descriptive details of the products/services and directly associated properties such as pricing. Hanagan makes no disclosure of the catalog including any indication of data to be received/output from the inputs/outputs of the products/services, or any other indication of the products/services ability to interface with other products/services. In fact, Hanagan merely facilitates the selection of products/services to make up a "bundle" or "package", for which no data transfers between the products/services need to be considered by the user when selecting the components and this explains why no indication of inputs/outputs are provided. In fact, given the standardised interfaces of Hanagan, we submit that it would actually go against the teachings of Hanagan to provide indications of data input/outputs.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the feature of *"the component specifications being indicative of the data to be received by inputs and/or output from outputs of the corresponding component"* is also not shown by Hanagan, such that any proper combination of Rigole and Hanagan cannot disclose or otherwise render this feature obvious.

It is also noted that Gangopadhyay also fails to disclose this feature, and in this regard we also observe that the Examiner has not considered Gangopadhyay to be relevant to features concerning ports and port specifications in the dependent claims in the outstanding Office Action.

Moreover, the cited prior art fails to disclose the feature of the amended claim 1 of *"wherein the user defined interconnections are defined by the user as interconnections between one or more of the outputs of at least some of the components to one or more of the inputs of at least some other components"*. To provide an example, this recitation allows the user to manually

define how the components are interconnected, and thereby manually define the particular transfers of data between the entities performing the service portions represented by the components. We note that this feature is at least in part based upon the similar recitations of the previously pending claim 7 regarding *"allowing the user to define the component combination by connecting the ports of the selected plurality of components"*.

Hanagan and Rigole each fail to disclose such a feature. In fact, the Examiner has effectively acknowledged this failure of Hanagan and Rigole in the rejection of the previously pending claim 7 in the outstanding Office Action. Instead, the Examiner has asserted that Gangopadhyay discloses this feature in column 2, lines 15-23 and Fig. 3.

The Examiner has gone on to assert that the modification of the combined teachings of Rigole and Hanagan with these teachings of Gangopadhyay would be obvious to one or ordinary skilled in the art to include support for allowing a user to connect ports of selected components (using the end station). However, we respectfully submit that a user of a system that might result from the Examiner's asserted combination of Rigole and Hanagan would not be motivated or otherwise led towards modifying such a system to incorporate the identified teachings of Gangopadhyay.

A system based upon a combination of the teachings of Rigole and Hanagan might allow a user to define a bundle of services such as different communication services, as described by Hanagan, based on a selection of those services from multiple available service providers using on a comparison of the different service offerings from those providers, as described by Rigole. However, the resulting system would not need the user to define interconnections between the outputs of some of services and inputs of other services, nor would this user definition of interconnections even be desirable. This is because Rigole and Hanagan each teach towards simplifying the process of allowing a user to select a service, to the point where the user simply selects service offerings from an ordered list. Both Rigole and Hanagan teach of performing any tasks involved in activating/delivering the selected services without requiring the customer to define interfaces between those services, regardless of

whether such interfaces might be necessary, because this would unnecessarily complicate the customer experience.

Consider the case in which the customer wishes to bundle local and long distance calling and internet services. In such a case, a system based upon the combined teachings of Rigole and Hanagan would merely require that the customer select desirable ones of those services, possibly from multiple different service providers. However, it would be inconvenient for the customer to define any interfaces between the selected services, should these exist, and Rigole and Hanagan provide teachings to avoid such inconvenient customer input from being required.

In view of the above, it would go against the combined teachings of Rigole and Hanagan to require the user to define interconnections between inputs and outputs of the components in the manner claimed in the amended claim 1, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that the teachings of Gangopadhyay could not be combined with the teachings of Rigole and Hanagan to remedy their deficiencies with respect to the claimed feature of *"wherein interconnections are defined by the user as interconnections between one or more of the outputs of at least some of the components to one or more of the inputs of at least some other component"*.

In any event, it is submitted that Gangopadhyay does not disclose *"wherein interconnections are defined by the user as interconnections between one or more of the outputs of at least some of the components to one or more of the inputs of at least some other component"* because, as argued in a previous response, but rather Gangopadhyay merely describes interconnections between event links and activity nodes to define relationships between completion of functionality and generation of events (see column 7, lines 61-64). The interconnected elements in Gangopadhyay do not have inputs and/or outputs, as such, and the interconnection does not actually define a data transfer and therefore cannot be considered to be particularly relevant to the above mentioned feature, even if the interconnections are indeed user defined. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Rigole and

Hanagan could be combined with those of Gangopadhyay, which we do not concede, we respectfully submit that the combination would not sufficiently disclose the above mentioned feature.

Furthermore, the cited prior art does not disclose the feature of *"wherein the sequence of service portions has a user defined order in which the service portions associated with the plurality of components in the component combination are to be performed"* as recited in the amended claim 1. As discussed above, the order in which the service portions are performed are effectively defined by the user when the interconnections between the inputs and outputs of the components associated with the service portions are defined as part of defining the component combination. This allows the user to control the order of performing the service portions, which is not allowed in the prior art.

In the rejection of the previously pending claim 1, the Examiner has already acknowledged that Rigole fails to disclose *"the defined component combination defining a sequence of service portions"*, and therefore Rigole cannot be relevant to the sequence of service portions having a user defined order. Instead, the Examiner has asserted that Hanagan discloses a *"sequence of service portions"*, identifying paragraph [0078], lines 1-11 as allegedly being relevant.

However, this disclosure of Hanagan merely relates to a "package" (allowing "bundling" of services) which is a combination of products and/or other packages, and Hanagan does not teach or imply that such a package has a sequence. This deficiency of Hanagan was argued in the previous response, and we note that in item 53 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has stated that a disclosure of Hanagan at paragraph [0081], lines 3-8 discloses tasks that have a sequence when processing a request to implement a device. These disclosures of Hanagan are reproduced below for convenience, with the particular portions of this disclosure that have been identified by the Examiner in item 53 having been underlined:

"OP 22 accepts requests for work as input. The work request is analyzed to determine the tasks required to complete the request, as well as all scheduling dependencies that are required. The result is a workflow, identifying the proper order in which tasks must be completed, the estimated time required to perform a task, and the type of resource(s) required for each task." [Hanagan, paragraph [0081], lines 3-8, emphasis added]

Initially, we note that this workflow of Hanagan does not actually relate to a sequence of the "services" of Hanagan which the Examiner has deemed equivalent to the claimed "service portions", but to tasks that are required in order to activate a particular service selected by a customer. As such, we do not believe this disclosure of Hanagan actually discloses a *"sequence of service portions"* as defined in the claims.

In any event, it is clear from the disclosures of Hanagan that this workflow does not have *"a user defined order in which the service portions associated with the plurality of components in the component combination are to be performed"*. Instead, the workflow is provided by an Order Processing component in an automatic process, and Hanagan does not provide any teaching that a customer would need, or even desire, to have any input into the order of the workflow.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Rigole and Hanagan each fail to disclose *"wherein the sequence of service portions has a user defined order in which the service portions associated with the plurality of components in the component combination are to be performed"*. It is also submitted that Gangopadhyay does not resolve these deficiencies, particularly in view of the above arguments concerning the disclosures of Gangopadhyay and whether these can be properly combined with the teachings of Rigole and Hanagan.

Moreover, the cited prior art fails to disclose *"wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed in the user defined*

order". It follows that this feature of the amended claim 1 is not disclosed because the cited prior art fails to render obvious the *"user defined order"* of the sequence of service portions, as discussed immediately above.

Furthermore, the feature of the amended claim 1 of *"wherein each service request includes an indication of the user defined interconnections of the respective inputs and/or outputs of the component with inputs and/or outputs of one or more other components in accordance with the component combination"* is not disclosed by the cited prior art.

In essence, this feature means that a service request, which is transferred to an entity for performing a service portion associated with a component to request that the respective service portion be performed, provide an indication to the entity of how the component is interconnected with other components in the component combination. For example, these indications of interconnections of the inputs/outputs of a component may allow the entity to perform the service portion associated with the component in a particular way that is suitable for the types of data that will be received from other entities, and will also allow the entity to perform the service portion in such a way as to output data to other entities responsible for subsequent service portions in the sequence of service portions, in a manner that is compatible with those other entities.

This feature involves the incorporation of further limitations to a feature of the previously pending claim 1 in which *"each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component"*.

The Examiner had previously acknowledged that Rigole failed to disclose this feature, but asserted that the disclosure of Hanagan at paragraph [0081], lines 3-9 (which was reproduced above) was relevant to this feature as previously recited. Specifically, the Examiner has asserted that this feature of Hanagan is disclosed because "a request is analyzed to produce a workflow which identifies the proper order in which tasks must be performed" and that this

workflow identifying the proper order is allegedly equivalent to the interconnections between tasks.

It was previously argued that the above mentioned disclosure of Hanagan was not sufficient to disclose the feature of *"each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component"*, although in item 55 of the outstanding Office Action the Examiner has disagreed and has stated that another disclosure of Hanagan at paragraph [0185], lines 1-10, where the user creates association rules between the new service and existing services, is also relevant to the feature.

In any event, and notwithstanding the above arguments regarding the failure of the cited prior art to disclose interconnections between inputs and outputs of the components in general, it is respectfully submitted that Rigole and Hanagan fail to disclose the additional limitations of the above mentioned feature.

Accordingly, with reference now to the revised form of this feature as it appears in the amended claim 1, it is noted that the association rules between the services in Hanagan do not necessarily involve interconnections between inputs and outputs of components. As argued in the previous response, these association rules do not even necessarily define interconnections between the components which are transfers of data between the entities of respective components.

In any event, the Hanagan does not provide any specific disclosures regarding an indication of these association rules in the work request described in paragraph [0081] of Hanagan. Furthermore, given that the portions of paragraph [0081] considered relevant by the Examiner concern the workflow of tasks required to activate a particular service, and there is no mention of association rules between different services in this context, we do not believe the association rules are even considered in the analysis of the work request.

It is also noted that the current amendments to this feature are based at least in part upon the recitations of the previously pending claim 14, which has now been cancelled. In the rejection of claim 14 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that the disclosure of Rigole at column 10, lines 6-14 is relevant to the indication of the indications for each of the ports (inputs/outputs) of the respective component. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the data channels, whose endpoints are allegedly equivalent to ports, are determined by the structure of and the programs that operator on the data of a service request and are therefore included in the service request.

However, as discussed above, the disclosures of Rigole in this first paragraph of column 10 do not relate to the "services" of Rigole which the Examiner has considered equivalent to the "components" of the claims. Accordingly, we respectfully submit that these disclosures cannot be particularly relevant to indicating the interconnections between inputs and outputs of components as claimed. In any event, the identified disclosures of Rigole in column 10 do not relate to a service request requesting a respective service portion to be performed, and further do not relate to an indication of interconnections between the inputs and outputs of a component associated with the respective service portion.

In view of the above, we respectfully submit that neither Rigole nor Hanagan discloses the claimed feature of *"wherein each service request includes an indication of the user defined interconnections of the respective inputs and/or outputs of the component with inputs and/or outputs of one or more other components in accordance with the component combination"*.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the above discussed features of the amended claim 1 provide patentable distinctions over the cited prior art.

The independent claims 24, 27, 32, 35, 39, 34 and 44 include similar amendments as for claim 1, and thus recite similar features. Accordingly, similar arguments apply with regards to the patentability of the remaining dependent claims.

With respect to the dependent claims, we note that these claims will also be patentable over the prior art by virtue of their dependence from the independent claims.

Nevertheless, in the event that the Examiner is not persuaded by our arguments regarding the independent claims, we also wish to highlight particular claims for further consideration by the Examiner.

For example, claim 6 has been amended for consistency with claim 1, and we submit that the amended claim 6 provides further recitations that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited prior art. In particular, the recitations of port specifications and their use in allowing the user to select components based on an indication of information to be received by or output from inputs/outputs of respective components are not taught or suggested in the cited prior art, taken alone or in any proper combination. Therefore we respectfully submit that the amended claim 6 provides even further patentable distinctions over the cited prior art.

Newly added claims 48 and 49 also provide additional patentable distinctions over the prior art. Specifically, claim 48 further recites how the component combination can be defined by the user, by manipulating graphical representations of the components to define interconnections between indications of inputs and outputs of components. Claim 49 particularly recites that the sequence of service portions is performed in the user defined order in accordance with the manipulated graphical representation. We respectfully submit that neither of these more detailed recitations are taught or suggested in the cited prior art, and thus claims 48 and 49 define further allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the amount of \$245 as payment for a Two-Month Extension of Time fee, small entity, to Deposit Account No. 07-1896. The Commissioner is further authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 07-1896 referencing the above-identified attorney docket number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 1, 2011

/J.D. Harriman/

J.D. Harriman II, Reg. 31,967

DLA Piper US LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6023
Tel: (310) 595-3000
Fax: (310) 595-3300